

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 18, 1817.

NOTICE.

This Number and the Two preceding ones have been duly entered at STATIONER'S HALL, and, of course, the *Copy Right* is secured to the Proprietor. My proceeding, as to this work, has been the most liberal that ever was adopted in a similar case. The price is as low and the allowance to retailers as high as possible; and, the most punctual attention is paid to all orders, both in town and country. If, indeed, any one were disposed to re-print, in order to give away, the case would be different; but, if any one be to receive a compensation for such great labour, it, surely, is the person by whom the labour is performed. Besides, I am by no means easy under the reflection, that any person should be publishing any thing under *my name*, when he may alter or garble, and thus misrepresent me, and injure, not only my reputation, but also *the cause*. Hence it is, that I have thought it necessary to declare, that nothing is of my writing, which is not published at No. 8, Catherine Street, or No. 192, Strand, London. If, therefore, after this second Notice, any one be found doing me wrong, I shall, though it will be very disagreeable to me, certainly seek an immediate legal remedy. The wholesale price is 12s. 6d. a hundred, and 11s. a hundred to such persons as take a thousand copies, or more, regularly every week. I omitted to mention, that I gladly give permission to publish my work in any regular newspaper.

AN ADDRESS

TO THE  
MEN OF NORWICH.

*On the Brunswick Knights.—Lord Sidmouth's Letter to them.—“Glorious Revolution.”—It is not true, that our Old Forefathers were ragged and starving Beggars.—Schemes of mock-Reform.—Meeting of Deputies in London.—Hatton-Garden Work.*

“STEWART and WALTER, make haste I  
“implore ye,  
“Or the Dogs and the Cats will be Knighted  
“before ye.”

PARODY ON PETER PINDAR.

London, Jan. 16, 1817.

MEN OF NORWICH,

Naturalists have observed, that the young ones which proceed from animals of a too advanced age are generally of feeble frame and precarious health, and, that, amongst the human species, the young children of aged parents add to these defects an imbecility of mind, which is described by the appellation of *born-ideots*. CORRUPTION, who is now manifestly upon her last legs, seems in this particular, to be subject to the general law of nature. Numerous are the instances, which might be cited of the degeneracy of her sons; but, I do not recollect any instance in which this symptom of the decay of her generative faculties has been so obvious as it has become by the whole litter of ideots, which she has just brought forth in your City, under the name of the *Knights of the Order of Brunswick*, who really



appear to have outstripped in folly, though not in baseness, Walter and Stewart and the whole tribe of literary hirelings in London.

It is now about a month since I was first informed, that, at Norwich, an Order of *Knighthood* had been established, the object of which was to embody the gallant sons of Corruption to fight under her banners against all Reformers generally, but more especially against *William Cobbett's Register*, which they honor with particular marks of their hatred. This is the foundation of their *Order*; and amongst the *means*, by which their object is to be prosecuted, is, an intended publication, to be entitled: "*The Brunswick Weekly Political Register, in direct opposition to William Cobbett's Work.*" On the 26th of December, the "*Installation*" took place, at the Rampant Horse Inn, Norwich, when an "*Ode*," that is to say, some stupid stuff, which they would call poetry, was, it seems, pronounced, which Ode was, as they state, "*Written by one of the Knights*"

There is something so very contemptibly ridiculous in all this; it is so much below childishness; it is so degrading to human intellect; that I could not, though pressed to it by some worthy friends in Norfolk, consent to notice it in print, feeling that it would be like the using of a sabre against a fly or a maggot. But, things, which may be wholly beneath notice in themselves, may be forced upon one's attention by their being associated with things of real importance, as the *garter* once dropped at a Ball from the knee of a favourite of one of our kings has become the ensign of an honour which the greatest of statesmen have been proud of. And, though a very different fate certainly awaits the Order of Brunswick, still that Order having now been associated in print with the name, officially given, of the *Secretary of State*, this circumstance

has rendered the whole thing of sufficient importance to be laid before the public, especially as some very essential political principles have, in this form, been challenged discussion.

The Knights have, it appears, transmitted an account of their establishment and of their installation and principles to LORD VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH, and, of this transmission and of his Lordship's determination thereon they have published the following account, printed by one BALL, Norwich, in the following words:

"Published by order of Knights Members of the Brunswick Club, at Special General Meeting, held at the Rampant Horse Inn, Norwich, December 31st, 1816. Copy of a Letter addressed to 'ARNALL THOMAS FAYERMAN, Esq. Surgeon, Norwich;' President of the Brunswick Association, from J. Beckett, Esq. Under Secretary of State, in reply to a Letter transmitted to Lord Viscount Sidmouth, enclosing six copies of the Second Edition of the Declaration of the Sentiments of this Assemblage

Whitehall, Dec. 30, 1816.

SIR,—“ I am directed by Lord Sidmouth, to acknowledge the receipt of your Letter of the 26th inst. and to express the satisfaction afforded by the *Public Spirit*, and *Constitutional Principles* which have led to the establishment of the Brunswick Club in the City of Norwich; I am at the same time to add, that Lord Sidmouth's opinion is in general favourable to Political Clubs of a description; although there may undoubtedly be circumstances under which such Institutions may not only be justifiable but highly useful; whether or not this is the case of Norwich at this time, it is impossible for him to judge, but his Lordship cannot hesitate to applaud the principles



your Association and the motives which have occasioned it.

" I am, Sir,

" Your most obedient

" And humble Servant,

" J. BECKETT."

To Arnall Thomas Fayerman, Esq.  
Surgeon, Norwich."

Upon the receipt of this Letter, the knights came to the following resolution:—" Resolved Unanimously, that the respectful thanks of this Association be transmitted to Lord Viscount Sidmouth, his Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, evincing at the same time our grateful feelings for the *very handsome approval* of our *views and principles* which he has been pleased to express, through the means of an Official Letter from J. Beckett, Esq. addressed to the President; and that all the Knights Members be required to sign the said Letter of thanks. By Order of the Association.—WILLIAM RACKHAM, *Secretary.*"

Now, my friends of Norwich, where reformers have met with the Mayor of our City at their head, and where that Mayor stands so honourably distinguished from those, who, instead of complying with the reasonable requisitions of their townsmen, have called meetings of *Special Constables and of Troops*; my friends of that ancient and always patriotic city, let us now, for a moment, forget the despicable and ridiculous character of these self-created knights, and, even while we are commenting on *those principles and motives*, which Lord Sidmouth is here said to have *approved* of, let us not take it for granted, that his Lordship has not been taken unaware upon this occasion; and let us, at any rate, by no means impute any disrespect towards the name of *Brunswick*, the use of which has here, as upon so many former occasions, been dishonoured by those, who, under that name, have endeavoured to find

shelter from that contempt or indignation which belonged only to their own folly or infamy.

You all remember, that, when the exposures, relative to the DUKE of YORK and Mrs. CLARKE took place, the friends, or, rather, the pretended friends, of the Duke, instead of candidly acknowledging, that the facts, which could not be refuted, were true; and, as sensible men would have done, appealing to the generosity of the nation, by observing, that boundless patronage happening to fall under the influence of boundless passion, the temptation had been too great to preserve the Duke from errors, into which many other men, and with no essentially wicked intentions, might have fallen; instead of taking this line, and instead of advising the Duke to throw himself manfully upon the naturally indulgent feelings of the country, which would have caused the whole matter to have been forgotten in a month, the pretended friends and supporters of His Royal Highness met the first opening of the charges against him by out-cries and accusations of *disloyalty* against the author of the charges, and against all those of similar politics, who were accused of hostility to the *House of Brunswick*, of being *Jacobins* and *Levellers*, and they were threatened with *everlasting infamy* if they failed to make their charges good. Thus accused, thus menaced, a very great majority of the nation took part against these unjust and foolish threateners; general politics became mixed up with the question; discovery after discovery was made, and, at last, the Duke had to bear the whole burden, brought on him not only by his own errors and frailties, but also the much greater burden created by the injustice and insolence of his pretended friends. Many men, who felt disposed, at first, to think but little of the matters charged against him, and were inclined rather to laugh than censure, had their



risible propensity turned into scorn and indignation, when they heard charges of selling commissions by a kept mistress and the promotion of a foot-boy from behind her chair to a command in the army, ascribed to a *traitorous design against the House of Brunswick!*

This feeling of scorn and indignation was perfectly natural; but, it unfortunately fell upon the wrong object; for, instead of the Duke, it ought to have alighted upon the heads of those, who pretended to be his friends, and who, in fact, while they affected to be defending him, were engaged in the defence of their own corrupt actions, as was afterwards most amply proved. Just such is the case now; and, you may be well assured, that, when you hear men bawling so loudly against what they have the impudence to call our *disloyal* endeavours, they have only in view to retain or to obtain profit to themselves out of the public purse; and, it very unfortunately happens, that they appear to succeed but too well in persuading those whose pretended friends they are, that they are their friends in *reality*, and that the people who pay the taxes are their *foes*.

If this be excusable in the Royal Family, who have so small a portion of communication with the people, it is not so easily excused in my LORD SIDMOUTH, who ought to know a great deal of the real state of the public mind, and who, of course, ought to know, that those who are labouring to bring about a Reform of the Parliament, have not only not intimated, but that they do not entertain, the smallest desire, to trench, in any way whatever, on the rights of either the Nobles or the King; and, therefore, it does seem very extraordinary, that his Lordship should have given countenance to, or, that he should have taken the smallest notice of, the contemptible Knights of the Order of Brunswick, and still more extraordinary, that he

should have expressed his *applause* of their *principles*, considering that these as far as they are divested of downright absurdity, are *hostile* to all those principles which placed the House of Brunswick upon the throne of England.

It would be a waste of time to endeavour to come at a comprehension of all the parts of that confused mass of nonsense, which the Brunswick Knights transmitted to Lord Sidmouth under the title of a *Declaration*; but I will just take their leading principle, which will be found in the following passage:

“Politically speaking, we cannot but view with extreme *pain* and *dread* the active endeavours of violent part men to sow discord and discontent in the minds of the lower orders, by the extensive association of Clubs professing the principles of JOHN HAMPDEN. It should never be forgotten, that whatever injuries, real or supposed, this idol of the people sustained from the government of Charles I. that *no extenuation* of the crime of fighting against the King and dying in the field as a Traitor can be found in the laws of either God or man; therefore, to mislead the people, by artful and specious praise of his pretended patriotic conduct resisting, by force of arms, what considered to be an infringement of his rights and privileges, is to teach the people to tread in his footsteps and to compel the state (regardless of the dreadful consequences that might result) to an immediate submission to all they demand.”

Now, in the first place, there are such things as *Hampden Clubs* in the kingdom; or, at least, they are of trifling amount as hardly to be worth of notice, if we except a Club of that name in London, and which Club consists in *reality* of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT and MAJOR CARTWRIGHT. that, this is altogether a false pretence and, as, I dare say if the truth were



known, these gallant Knights had money in view, when they appealed to Lord Sidmouth, they are, I think, fairly dictable for an attempt at fraud and obtain money under false pretences. For what other purpose should these men have applied to Lord Sidmouth? They could hardly expect that he would send troops to their aid; and, to writers against us, they seem to have become extinct, or, at least, so dry or so dull as no longer to be of any use. What, then, could these knights apply to Lord Sidmouth for? Then writers or loyal club-mongers communicate their schemes to the government, be assured that they seek money as naturally as a fly does food when it approaches a honey-pot.

It is also a very scandalous falsehood to say, that the HAMPDEN CLUB, or any of the Reformers, endeavour to urge the people to compel the state (the parliament, is meant, I suppose) by force of arms, to an immediate submission to their demands. We are uniformly, and, hitherto, most successfully, exhorted the people to adhere to a peaceable and orderly conduct. Such a falsehood as this, therefore, merits public execration, though the promulgation of it cannot fail to do good in the end, because it cannot fail to shew the badness of the cause of our enemies, who, unless their cause were desperate, would not resort to any falsehood at all.

But, to pass over all the rest of the audence and folly of these men, let us come to their grand principle; namely, that, "whatever injuries HAMPDEN sustained from the government of Charles the First, no attenuation of the crime of fighting against the king can be found in the laws of either God or man."

Now, my good friends of Norwich, this be so, the present Royal Family

and George the First and George the Second and Queen Anne and King William the Third and Lord Sidmouth and you and I and all the people in this nation were and are traitors against the House of Stuart and their heirs in the direct line of succession. My firm belief is, that LORD SIDMOUTH never read the declaration of these Chandler-shop Knights; and, I hope, that this will be a caution to him, not to permit any one to use his name in future in applauding any thing without first knowing what the thing is.

It signifies nothing, in this case, what were the injuries sustained by HAMPDEN, because it is here declared, that be they what they might, he had no right to resist by force of arms. Hence it would follow, that, if a king were to dissolve the parliament and levy taxes by his sole will, or were even to order his army to beat the people in the streets, or to poke out their eyes, the people must stand still and bear it all without any attempt to resist, because to resist would be to fight against the King! Oh no! Lord Sidmouth never could have read the paper of these Brunswick Knights. The history of JOHN HAMPDEN is, however, too interesting to be wholly omitted here.— Charles the First, who was beset by evil counsellors, and who had the misfortune to be married to a Bourbon wife, wished to rule the people of England in an arbitrary way. The parliaments (which were newly chosen then always when they were called together) opposed his views. He wanted money, and he issued a proclamation to raise taxes, suspecting that the parliament would not grant him the money. This was contrary to the laws of England. Mr. HAMPDEN, who was a gentleman of Buckinghamshire, would not pay the taxes imposed on him. He was sued before the Judges in the King's Courts, who, being subservient to the



King, decided against Mr. HAMPDEN. The King's necessities, however, at last compelled him to call a parliament; and, after long disputes between the King and them, an open civil war broke out, and, in that war, Mr. HAMPDEN lost his life in the field. The King, at last, would have gladly yielded up *much more* than his people *asked for at first*. But his yielding disposition came too late. He lost his life, as we all know, upon a scaffold, upon the charge of *treason* against the English People; and herein he tasted of that injustice and cruelty which his own ministers and judges had, in innumerable instances, practised on his suffering subjects in his name.

One would have thought, that an example so awful ought to have operated on his sons; but, so far from it, the second of those sons, *James the Second*, aided by the bloody *Judge Jefferies*, was guilty of acts of tyranny without end. The nation, resolved no longer to endure his ill-treatment, invited William Prince of Orange from Holland, who had married one of the king's daughters, to come and take the government upon him. William came *with an army*, who had some fighting with the king's troops, but the king, finding that the whole nation were deserting him, *fled to France*. William and his wife were made king and queen, and a law was passed to make every man *a traitor* who adhered to king James. When William and his wife were dead, another daughter of James became Queen, *by act of parliament*, and that was Queen Anne. Now, observe, James had sons alive all this while; but, they were called *Pretenders*, and the parliament actually compelled QUEEN ANNE to offer, by proclamation, a *reward for the head* of one of these her brothers. When Queen Anne died, an act of parliament had provided for the accession

of the present Royal Family, which was descended from a daughter of James the *First*, who was the father of Charles the First, and the grandfather of James the Second; and, by the same acts of parliament, the family of Stuart was set *aside for ever*.

These were pretty stiff proceedings and may serve as a record upon the file of the Chapter of the Knights of Norwich. But, as you perceive, there was not only *resistance* to King James but there was fighting against him by foreign soldiers brought over from Holland for the purpose! And yet your Knights tell us, that Mr. HAMPDEN was a *traitor* for fighting against the king, *whatever injuries he might have sustained*. There were men to preach the same doctrine at the time when James the Second was revelling in the blood of the people shed by *Judge Jefferies*; but, our forefathers were not so base and so foolish as to listen to those corrupt slaves; they rose against the stupid tyrant; they drove him from the throne; they afterwards set aside his despotic family *for ever*; and they happily succeeded in exalting and supporting the present Royal Family in their stead. This is what we mean by the "**GLORIOUS REVOLUTION**" and it is well worthy of note, that, the PROCLAMATION, issued in 1793 against the writings of your famous countryman, PAINE, he was accused of having *attacked* the principles of the "*Glorious Revolution*!"

The ignorance of the Chandler-Slacks Knights is equal to their impudence. Not only *since* the Revolution of 1688 above noticed; but, in all times, has the people of England claimed the right of resistance to oppression. I cannot quote the very words of Judge Blackstone from memory (and I have not the books near me), but, I know that, though a very *courtly* writer, maintained this right as an *inherent right* of every



people, and observes, that [the common sense of mankind will not suffer itself to be insulted by the contrary doctrine. And how was MAGNA CHARTA obtained? Why, by the Barons making open war upon the King, and compelling him to sign it. This Charter, which was a mere recognition of the *then* ancient laws of England, was actually *forced* from the king; and yet these impudent brawlers, these potentiant Knights tell you, that, let HAMPDEN'S injuries be what they might, it was *treason* in him to resist the king, and that his conduct was not to be justified by the laws either of God or man! The laws of *man*, as we have seen, clearly justify this resistance; and, as to the laws of *God*, if we are to take for his laws what we find recorded in the Scriptures, (and I know not where else to look for them) how numerous are the instances, in which oppressors were punished, Ministers, Kings and Queens! An instance of each may serve. HAMMON was hanged on a lofty gibbet for his oppressions on Mordecai and the Jews. But, the case in point is that of *Ahab* and *Jezebel*. King Ahab had taken a liking to the vineyard of *Naboth*, which the latter refused to sell him, it having descended to him from his forefathers. Jezebel, in order to put her husband in possession of the wished-for plat of ground, contrived to have Naboth seized upon a false charge of blasphemy, and to have him stoned to death. AHAB was, by the command of God, killed in battle for this act, and, his son, AHAZIAH, having succeeded him with the curse still sticking to his family, JEHU, who was *an officer in the service of Ahaziah*, took a chosen band with him, slew the king his master, and afterward the Queen-mother, whom he ordered to be thrown out of a window, "and some of her blood was sprinkled on the wall and on the horses, and he trod her

"under foot." Some of the friends of Ahaziah called this "*treason*" on the part of Jehu; but Jehu answered, "Surely I have seen yesterday the *blood of Naboth* and the blood of his sons, and I will requite thee in this plat, saith the Lord."

With this I take my leave of the Knights of the Order of Brunswick, being well assured, that they will never again show their faces in the streets of Norwich, unaccompanied with hisses and groans, though they carry, by way of protection, the applauding letter from the Office of the Secretary of State.

Let me now beg your attention to a subject of very deep interest at this time, and with regard to which it is of primary importance that we should all entertain correct opinions. We complain, that the people of this kingdom are *worse off* than they used to be. We talk of the *good old times* of our forefathers. We conclude, that we might, under a good system, be *as happy* as our forefathers were; and, this good system we (I do for one) most firmly believe, would be brought about speedily by a reform of the parliament, and this belief we have *proved* to be rational. The sons of Corruption meet us at the threshold of the argument, and assert, in the most unqualified manner, that we are much *better off* than our forefathers were, whom they represent as a set of despicable raggamuffins and vassals. To read the essays upon this subject in the *COURIER* and the *TIMES*, one would suppose, that, until the days of Pitt, or thereabouts, Englishmen were a species of barbarians, clad in skins of wild animals, sleeping amongst fern under hedges, and living upon hips and haws.

Now, if this were the case, the answer would be worth very little, unless it could be shewn, that, because a father has been miserable the children



ought to be miserable too. But, this is not the case. The charge against our forefathers is as false as the hearts of those who make it. Englishmen, until within the last fifty years, when long parliaments and banking and funding and borrowing and taxing began to produce poverty and misery and crimes, were *always well off*, in the oldest of times. They were always an industrious, an honest, a frank, a sincere race of men, and always bore an unshaken attachment to their political rights. Those, who, like me, are now fifty years of age, can well remember, when it was thought a *serrowful sight* to see a labouring man apply for parish relief. Will these libellers of the people say, that our *natures* have been changed? And, if we were to allow that, *by what* have they been changed? No: the blood of our fathers circulates in our veins, but the want of what they possessed as the fair fruit of their toil, has compelled us to resort to alms and to parish relief. Well do I remember, when old men, common labourers, used to wear to church good broad-cloth coats which they had worn at their weddings. They were frugal and careful, but they had encouragement to practise those virtues. The household goods of a labouring man, his clock, his trenchers and his pewter plates, his utensils of brass and copper, his chairs, his joint-stools, his substantial oaken tables, his bedding and all that belonged to him, form a contrast with his present miserable and worthless stuff that makes one's heart ache but to think of. His beer and his bread and meat are now exchanged for the cat-lap of the tea-kettle, taxed to more than three-fourths of its prime cost, and for the cold and heartless diet of the potatoe plat. I can well remember when the very poorest of the people would not eat potatoes, and I have lived to see people hanged for forcing them out of a market cart at their own price! I can

remember, when every poor man brewed a barrel of ale to be drunk at the lying-in of his wife, and another to be spent at the christening of the child. Now, I know not the instance of the cheering smell of malt finding its way into his dwelling, where dreariness and dread preside upon occasions which used to produce scenes of pleasing anxiety, congratulation, and innocent mirth. Perhaps many thousands of persons of my own age will read what I am now writing, and, if they have been conversant in the sphere of life, to which I am adverting, their hearts will but too loudly tell them that the picture is true.

But, to *what period* will the calumniators of our forefathers go back? I will take them back *four hundred years*, and will draw my description of what our forefathers were *then* from SIR JOHN FORTESQUE'S work on the *excellence of the Laws of England*. This gentleman, who was Lord Chancellor in the reign of HENRY THE SIXTH, wrote a book for the instruction of that king's son, one of the objects of which book was to convince him, that it was his *interest* as well as his *duty* to preserve inviolate that excellent system of laws. In the course of his lessons, which are divided into Chapters, he gives the Prince a description of the *effects* of the good laws of England compared with that of the bad laws of France, which some of the Prince's ancestors had endeavoured to introduce into England. This leads him to speak of the *condition* of the English compared with the *condition* of the French; and, here it is, that we find the dresses, the houses, and the food and manner of living of our forefathers described; those forefathers who the COURIER and TIMES would make us believe, were a set of vagrants, living upon pig-nuts and acorns and haws! Alas! The picture which is here given of France, would really be



very nearly applicable to Eng-  
 speaking of France, after enumera-  
 Now several cruel laws, he proceeds in  
 ceering words: "Without consideration  
 to his of these things, other heavy *taxes*  
 dread are assessed yearly upon every village  
 used to within the kingdom for the king's  
 anxiety, service; neither is there ever any  
 birth, permission or abatement of taxes.  
 ons of exposed to these and other calami-  
 n now es, the *Peasants* (country people)  
 onver- re in *great hardship and misery*.  
 I am their constant *drink is water*, neither  
 at too do they taste, throughout the year,  
 s true, any other liquor; unless upon some  
 ummi- extraordinary times, or festival days.  
 k? I Their clothing consists of *Frocks*,  
 years, a little short jerkins made of *canvass*,  
 what do better than common *sack-cloth*;  
 SIR they do not wear any woollens, ex-  
 excel- cept of the coarsest sort; and that  
 This only in the garment under their  
 cellor rocks; nor do they wear any trowse,  
 XTH, out from the knees upwards; their  
 n of legs being exposed and naked. The  
 s of women go bare-foot, except on holi-  
 him, days. They do not eat *any flesh*,  
 s his unless it be the fat of bacon, and that  
 llent in very small quantities, with which  
 his they make a soup. Of other sorts,  
 hap- either boiled or roasted, they do not  
 tion so much as taste, unless it be of the  
 Eng- *wards and offals* of sheep and  
 bad bullocks, and the like, which are  
 the killed for the use of the *gentle-folks*  
 d to and the *merchants*; for whom also,  
 ads *quails, partridges, hares* and the like,  
 the are reserved, upon pain of the gal-  
 lion ies. As for their poultry, the soldiers  
 we consume them, so that scarce the  
 the eggs, slight as they are, are indulged  
 re- them by way of dainty. And, if it  
 ers happen that a man is observed to  
 ld thrive in the world, and become rich,  
 ts, he is *presently assessed to the king's*  
 nd tax, proportionably more than his  
 is poorer neighbours, *whereby he is soon*  
 be reduced to a level with the rest."

My good friends of Norwich, what  
 think you of this picture? Look about  
 you, and then remember, that this  
 honest old Chancellor of England tells  
 the Prince that these are the conse-  
 quences of a government *wherein the*  
*people have no share*. He then comes  
 to describe the effects of what he calls  
 that *Political Mixed Government*, which  
 prevails in England; and after describ-  
 ing the security which men in England  
 have, for their property, and for the  
 fruit of their labours, he proceeds thus:  
 "The king cannot despoil the subject,  
 " without making ample satisfaction for  
 " the same; he cannot by himself or his  
 " ministry, lay taxes, subsidies, or any  
 " imposition whatever, upon the sub-  
 " ject: he cannot alter the laws, or  
 " make new ones, without the express  
 " consent of the whole kingdom in Par-  
 " liament assembled: every inhabitant  
 " is at his liberty fully to use and  
 " enjoy whatever his farm produceth,  
 " The fruits of the earth, the increase  
 " of his flock, and the like: all the  
 " improvements he makes, whether by  
 " his own proper industry, or of those  
 " he retains in his service, are his  
 " own to use and enjoy, without the  
 " let, interruption or denial of any.  
 " If he be in any wise injured, he shall  
 " have his amends and satisfaction  
 " against the party offending: HENCE  
 " it is, that the inhabitants of England  
 " are rich in gold, silver, and all the  
 " necessities and conveniences of life.  
 " They drink no water, unless at cer-  
 " tain times, upon a religious score, and  
 " by way of doing penance. They are  
 " fed in great abundance, with all sorts  
 " of flesh and fish, of which they have  
 " plenty every where; they are clothed,  
 " throughout, in good woollens; their  
 " bedding and other furniture in their  
 " houses are of wool, and that in great  
 " store: they are also well provided with  
 " all sorts of household goods, and neces-  
 " sary implements for husbandry; every



“one according to his rank, hath all things which conduce to make life easy and happy.” And after this he observes, that these are the effects of laws, which are founded upon the principle, that “a king is given for the sake of the kingdom, and not a kingdom for the sake of a king.”

Such was the plain and bold and honest language of a Chancellor of England *four hundred years ago*, and such was the happy and honourable state of our forefathers in those times. And, yet the insolent sons of Corruption would fain have us believe, that we are much *better off* than our forefathers were, and that we ought to be very *grateful* that we are not compelled to live, like blackbirds, upon wild berries and worms. Let any man look at the dress and food of our labourers now; and let him say, if he can, that they do not resemble those which this old Lawyer describes as those of the *French* in his day. A *short smock frock* is the general garment; and, not only are many of these made of *sack-cloth*, but I have seen many actually made out of *old sacks*, which had become too rotten to hold corn! They do not, indeed, go *bare-legged*; the climate does not admit of it; but many of them have *no stockings*, bits of rag are wrapped round their feet to keep their feet from perishing in their shoes, and pieces of *old sack*, or *rags of some sort*, are tied round their legs instead of stockings. One half of the married men have not a second shirt, and that which they have is all in rags. It is notorious, that they do not *taste flesh* from month's end to month's end, and that their *sole* drink is that very *water*, which FORTESQUE says used to be the drink of the *French*, and of which he says the English *never drank*, except for religion's sake. Little did this, our famous countryman, imagine what days his honoured country was destined to see under the Pitts,

the Percevals and Castlereagh's! Little did he imagine, when he was describing the living upon SOUP as a proof of the degraded state of the French, that Englishmen would ever be reduced to such a state as to be fed at *Soup Stalls by Subscription!* Little did he, when he was speaking of the *heavy taxes* on the French, suppose, that Englishmen would one day pay away the half of their earnings in taxes! Little did he, when talking of the standing army in France, imagine that the day was come, when regiments of standing soldiers in England would be seen *subscribing a day's pay* to help feed the people, from the taxes on whose *sugar, &c.* their pay partly came! Little did he, when he was boasting of the good warm and decent clothing and bedding of the people of England, imagine that the time would come, when a Lord Mayor of London, would, from motives of compassion, advertise for *old Cloth* to cover the nakedness of that people by day, and for *old Bedding* to keep them from perishing by night! Little did he imagine, when he was painting the miseries that the French suffered from the tyranny of their Princes, that the lot of England would be so changed, that a French Prince would *subscribe* towards a fund for *feeding the English people with Soup!*

What, then, has produced this change? Why, *taxation* to be sure. The same causes generally produce the same effects. It was the taxes that made the French miserable in dress and food; and here also the effect followed the cause. It is curious to remark, too, that, as soon as the *Bourbon* Government was overthrown in France, the *People* began to flourish, to dress better and live better; and, though the nation had been at war all the time, Mr. BIRBECK, in his excellent little work, tells us, that, when he went over to France in 1814, he found the country people



ing in great *ease and happiness*. He  
 ked, he says, what was become of all  
 the *miserable Peasantry*; and he was  
 id, that *the Revolution had changed*  
*their lot*. He says, that the common  
 labourers were *well dressed*, that each  
 man had *from ten to fourteen shirts*;  
 and, in short, that they were a happy  
 race of men compared to the miserable  
 and depressed creatures, whom he had  
 left behind him in England. Mr. BIRK-  
 BECK is well known to be a gentleman  
 of veracity as well as of very exten-  
 sive knowledge; and, being also an in-  
 dependent man, his word may be relied  
 on. But we need no *Revolution* to re-  
 store us to a state of happiness. We  
 want nothing but a relaxation of taxa-  
 tion, and the choosing of our own re-  
 presentatives, so that we may *not be*  
*taxed without our consent*, which is the  
 law of the land, and which law of the  
 land is our *birth-right*.

SIR JOHN FORTESQUE did not talk  
 vaguely about the *Constitution*, which  
 the sons of Corruption make to mean  
 any thing that they please. He talked  
 about the *laws*, and his proof of the  
 goodness of a government, was, that it  
 produced *ease and happiness amongst*  
*the people*. This was his proof of a  
 good government; and, certainly, this  
 is the only test by which to try a  
 government.

The sons of Corruption, unable to  
 say that the people are in *ease and*  
*happiness*, cook up a doctrine of *fata-*  
*city*. They say, it is the *fate* of na-  
 tions, when they become *refined*, to  
 become miserable; and, therefore, that  
 we are in a state of *natural* decay,  
 and that no fault is to be ascribed to  
 the system or to any body. But, if  
 this were true, how comes it, that the  
 people live so much in *ease and hap-*  
*piness in America*? There are many  
 beautiful cities in America; numerous  
 persons of immense fortunes; multi-  
 tudes of fine carriages and horses; finer

streets than any in England or in Eu-  
 rope; whole streets of houses, the  
 cornices and door-ways of marble, the  
 roofs covered with lead or slate, the  
 gutters and spouts made of copper; an  
 immense mercantile shipping; a noble  
 and gallant navy; trade, commerce and  
 manufactures very extensive; three or  
 four hundred newspapers; reading and  
 writing universal; and, in short, every  
 luxury and refinement known in Eng-  
 land, from which country, too, the set-  
 tlers of that country went. How hap-  
 pens it, that civilization and refinement  
 have not produced a miserable popu-  
 lation *there*? How happens it, that  
 there is no pauperism and beggary in  
 that country? How happens it that,  
*there*, the labourer, though with a fa-  
 mily, may, if he will, *put by twenty or*  
*thirty pounds a year*? Why, the reasons  
 are, that, in that country, the *taxes*  
*are so light*, the government so little  
 expensive; and these arise from the  
 people *choosing freely their own*  
*representatives*, and *not being taxed*  
*without their own consent*. The  
 government there, with the mere  
 exception of names of officers and  
 ranks, is built upon the ancient laws of  
 England. *Magna Charta* is the law of  
 the land there as much as it is, or ever  
 was, here. All our ancient law-books  
 are of as much authority there as they  
 ever were in England. In that country  
 a *regular soldier* is never seen, except  
 in the distant fortresses on the frontiers  
 to defend the nation against sudden at-  
 tacks; and even these soldiers are so  
 few in number as scarcely to be called  
 an army, the whole not consisting of  
 more than *six thousand men*. Yet, no  
 one fears any riots, or breaches of the  
 peace in that country. All men are so  
 deeply interested in the upholding of  
 the laws, that they are all its voluntary  
 defenders. Elections are going on  
 there *every year*; the Chief Magistrate,  
 the Members of the Legislature, the



Governors, the Sheriffs, the Constables, all are elected by the people; and yet all is tranquil, all is obedience to the laws, all is ease and happiness.

Why, then, are we to believe, that England is *doomed* to be miserable? Why are we to believe, that our country is *fated* to decline and become nothing? How came the French to revive so quickly after numerous ages of misery? No: we will entertain no such belief. We will believe, that if our burdens be lightened and our right of election restored, England will be what she ought to be; and, my firm conviction is, that a reform of the parliament, upon the principles of our ancient laws, would, without any infringement on the rights of either Nobles or King, and without any one act of injustice towards any description of men, enable us, in the course of five years, to say of England, in the words of FORTESQUE, that, here the people "*drink no water*," they are well clothed and fed and lodged, and have all things which conduce to an *easy and happy life*. But, it is my conviction not less firm, that, unless a reform take place, great as our present miseries are, they are *nothing compared to what we have to expect*.

But, it is not any scheme of *Mock-Reform*, that will tend to restore the nation to an "*easy and happy life*." Such a scheme those men, who call themselves WHIGS, have on foot, and the object of it is to CHEAT the people. A *Triennial Parliament*, a mere lopping off of some *Sinecures and Pensions* without any *retrospect*, a little *extension of voting in Scotland*! Is this, do they and their coadjutors of the Edinburgh Review imagine, to satisfy the people, who understand their rights as well as they do? Oh, no! They must be idiots indeed, to hope to cheat the people in this way. Nations as well as individuals are seldom made fools *twice* in their lives, or, at least, *exactly in the same way*. The fools, who, after being disappointed at not seeing the man dance in a *quart* bottle, went with the full expectation of seeing him dance in a *pint* bottle, might, possibly, have swallowed the bait, which the WHIGS intend to hold out; but, I venture to assure these conceited gen-

tlemen, that the Reformers of the present day are to be satisfied with nothing short of the *real* Constitution of the country. They expect *annual parliaments* and suffrage as extensive as practicable, which may, perhaps, safely stop at all *house-holders*, whether they pay *direct taxes* or not, seeing that this would exclude all menial and yearling servants and other persons not having a house or home. This, however, at minor points, such as the *ballot* and the mode of taking the votes, may become subject of consideration between this time and the Meeting of Parliament. The *substantials* are *Annual Parliaments* and the *Voting of all house-holders* of whatever degree, and that these will be adopted, I would bet the Whigs the amount of a thousandth part of all their *Sinecures and Pensions*, if I had so much in the world. Oh, no! The people of Manchester and Birmingham and Sheffield have no inclination to have Members chosen for them by Old Sarum, Gatton, and Winchelsea. In short, the thing is too ridiculous to think of under the name of *Reform*. Call it a *Tub to the Whale*; call it a *Humbug*; call it a *Cheat* or a *Fraud*; and, it is well enough; but, to call it a *Reform* is too gross to escape ridicule and contempt.

In the meanwhile, that son of Corruption, the COURIER, is greatly alarmed, and very justly so, at the approaching waggon load of petitions and especially at a Meeting of Reform *Deputies*, who, it appears, are to meet in London on the 22d instant. We will first hear what he says upon the subject, and then make our remarks, and see on what the *alarm* is founded. — "An Advertisement of an *extraordinary nature* has been inserted in some of the papers, without exciting that attention which it seems to deserve. Most of our Readers recollect the meeting at Edinburgh of a number of Delegates from different clubs or societies. This meeting assumed the name of a Convention — the ostensible object of which was to bring about a Reform in Parliament. — By the advertisement we began by alluding to, it appears that various assemblies have not only been held



in Lancashire for a Reform, but that fourteen of them have named Deputies who met, at Middleton; that in consequence of the opinion expressed by this meeting of Deputies, an extraordinary general meeting of the Hampden Club is convoked for Saturday next, to consult upon a proposed Bill for a Reform in Parliament, which extraordinary meeting is to be followed up, on the 22d instant, by a meeting or convocation of *Delegates* from petitioning cities, towns, and other communities, 'to confer together in the metropolis, on the best means of effectuating a constitutional Reform of the Commons' House.' Such are the words of the advertisement.—Now, in referring to the period when the Scotch Convention and other meetings were held, and the proceedings subsequently adopted, we shall observe a remarkable similarity in the language held then and now. In one of the addresses to a Society at Norwich, in 1793, it was said that 'they looked for no Reform but from the Convention they had in view, advising, however, a continuance of Petitions for Reform as a cover to their designs.' The Corresponding Society in 1793, 'assumed the task of watching over the transactions of Parliament, and of setting boundaries to its power.' In one of their meetings 'the members of every department of the State were vilified as unworthy and incompetent to hold their official situations.' At another meeting it was stated, 'that some things were not to be submitted to, either with or without the sanction of Parliament.' At the period to which we have adverted, Mr. Dundas said, that 'it could not be doubted that a Convention on the principle of establishing Universal Suffrage and Annual Parliaments was totally inconsistent with the existence of the Monarchy and Parliament.' And Lord Thurlow alleged, 'that the constant mention of a Parliamentary Reform could no more clear these societies of illegal intent, as their proposed Convention in the expression of God save the King at the bottom of a seditious libel, could

'clear it of sedition.'—Now it may be inferred by some that we allude to the period of 1794, with the view of counselling the same legislative measures as were thought necessary then. We do not. But we do contend that if there existed a necessity for vigour and vigilance at that time, there would surely be no excuse for a total want of both now, when Parliamentary Reform, if not, as we believe, a cover to other designs, must lead to a total abolition of the present frame and constitution of the Government."

Yes, most of the readers of the COURIER may recollect, and certain it is, that millions of other men never will forget, the meeting at Edinburgh, in 1794, and "the subsequent proceedings thereon." But, no one recollects, because it is totally false, that the Reformers of 1794 ever said, that their measures to procure Reform was "a cover to other designs." Yes, we remember 1794, and we now feel the effects of Reform not having taken place at that time. How much blood, how much treasure, how much misery, would have been avoided, if the Reformers had then been listened to instead of being crushed by the arm of power!

How gravely this poor feeble hireling tells us of what Mr. Dundas SAID and of what Lord Thurlow ALLEGED upon that occasion; that Dundas, whose sun of life went down so bright, who was covered with sinecures and who has left a son so covered; and that Lord Thurlow, who possessed a large pension to the day of his death, and whose heir has a sinecure of five thousand pounds a year! What do we, or what does truth or reason or justice care what they said, or what they alleged?

But, this Advertisement for the Meeting of Deputies is, we are told, of "an extraordinary nature." Is it indeed? Now, it so happens, that even this is as gross a falsehood as can well be imagined. A few weeks ago, there was a "Meeting of Deputies" from all the Counties in England, held in London, to consult on an application to be made to parliament to pass a law to prohibit the importation of wool, and these Deputies, or Delegates, call them which



you please, were sent up from *primary Meetings* in the several Counties. How came the Courier not to be *alarmed* at this? There has been a Meeting, or *Convention*, for the meaning of the two words is the same, of the Deputies, or Delegates, of the *Ship owners*, of the *Negro-holders*, of the *Sugar-growers*, of the *Dissenters*, and, in all these cases, there have been *Advertisements* in abundance; there have been *Secretaries*, *Committees of Correspondence*, and all the regular establishments belonging to *organized bodies*; and, the object invariably has been *to apply to the Parliament to do something*, and, in some cases, the thing asked for has been very unreasonable, very unjust, or very foolish.

Why, then, are not deputies to meet to prepare an application for a *Parliamentary Reform*, agreeably to the Constitution, that is to say, agreeably to the law of the land? *Any body else*, it appears, may have meetings of Deputies, except those who seek a restoration of the liberties and happiness of the country! However, this good hireling, on whom, together with WALTER, the people ought to keep their eye steadily fixed, assures us, that, whatever some may infer, he, "in alluding to the *period of 1794, does not mean to counsel the same legislative measures as were then thought necessary.*" To wit: *Gagging Bills*. But, he has been counselling these measures for months past; and for this purpose, he hatched, as far as he was able, by all sorts of falsehoods and false alarms, the *plots* of the memorable second of December. He *does not now* counsel *Gagging Bills*, because he *dares not*. If he had not sense to see, that even the *threat* of such Bills would blow up the last remains of the credit of the country, *others*, it appears, have had the sense to see it, and they have *choaked off* the bloody-minded scribe, who in his over-charged zeal, was sticking his fangs into the very vitals of the system that he was wishing to defend.

But, he says, that "he does *contend*, that, IF, there existed a necessity for *vigour and vigilance* in 1794, there would, surely, be no excuse for *a want of both now.*" This is a gentle

reproach to Lord SIDMOUTH, which is very unjust after the readiness, with which his Lordship's underling, in his Lordship's name, applauded the installation and principles of the *Norwich Knights!* Here are *vigour and vigilance*, are there not? Will not the *Knights* take care of the thing? What damsel in romance ever had such efficient defenders as these *Knights* may prove? Besides, had there fallen more fleas of snow than there are feathers upon a goose's body, when his Lordship dispatched off a circular letter to the *Lords Lieutenant* to call upon the *Magistrates* to call upon the *Parish Officers* to keep the roads *clear of snow*, in order that the communications might not be interrupted; though it is very well known, that there is *no law* to compel any parish-officers to obey any such call, and though it is very certain, that no farmer in England would send a man or horse upon any such business. Was not this *vigour!* Was not this *vigilance!* What would the *COURIER* have? Besides, where was ever more industry and vigilance to surpass that of GREY GIFFORD, at the Police-Office at Worcester Street, when he got hold of DYALL's Spencean Memorial, and transmitted it to Lord SIDMOUTH. And, then again, the handing of the paper, by some one, to the *COURIER*, who, thinking that Mr. HUNT was bringing it forward at the first Spencean Meeting, actually published a "*reasonable*" part of it, and thus sent it off to the country as having been *proposed* by Mr. HUNT, when the gentleman, not so easily caught in the trap, had *thrown it aside*, and had *proposed something else!* Well, then, what think you of the *vigour and vigilance* of Mr. WONTNER, the City Merchant, who pursued a young fellow many miles through Worcestershire, concluding that he *must be* "the assassin," YOUNG WATSON, because, when at a public-house, he had "*looked sideways* at the Landlady's daughter. If these be not proofs of *vigour and vigilance* sufficient to quiet the *COURIER*, I do not know what will quiet him.

We forget, however, the word IF in such great import in this concluding



graph of the COURIER. "IF vigour and vigilance were necessary in 1794." Aye, IF they were! But, think, that they *were not*. We say, the Reformers then said, that *Reform only was necessary*; so we say still, so will say the Deputies, at whose meeting in London the Courier is so much alarmed. Well *he* may be alarmed, for their object is to destroy on which he feeds and fattens. As to those, who live upon their incomes, justly derived, or by the sweat of their brow, they have no ground for alarm, but great ground for hope and gratulation.

In conclusion, my worthy friends of Norwich, let me beg you to have forbearance under your sufferings, to observe peaceable and loyal conduct, but by no means to slacken in your endeavours to obtain the great object of all our wishes. Look at the noble Meetings at Bristol and still more recently at Bath, where many thousands of men were assembled in the most peaceable manner, and where speeches have been delivered, which would do honour to any assembly in the world. Mr. HICKMAN and Mr. YOUNG, who spoke at that meeting, and who apologized for their want of being accustomed to perform such a task, are new specimens of spirit and the talent, which the friends and the cause of freedom have brought forth. At that meeting only one man behaved in a *riotous* manner, that man, whose name is *Barlow*, it seems, selected for his "*loyalty*" to be one of 2,000 *special constables*, who were sworn in to *assist the troops* in protecting the city against the predicted *violence* of the Reformers! As it is all over the kingdom. On the side of Reform all is peace and harmony; on the side of Corruption all is

The only full and fair Report, that I have seen, of this Meeting is to be found in the Morning paper, THE STATESMAN, and in the Evening paper THE OBSERVER. I am often told by friends in the country, which is the best weekly paper. There are several good ones; but, as a collection of *News*, wholly uncoloured with political comment, and as a full and impartial reporter of what takes place at public Meetings all over the country, I should certainly prefer THE OBSERVER, though the *News* is a very good weekly paper, and contains articles written with great ability.

clamour, violence, and falsehood. But again, I say, *slacken not* in your efforts. If public general meetings are inconvenient, or not to be obtained, meet in your *several trades*, meet where and how you can, but let all be done *openly*; no *secrets*, no *disguise*: the cause of Reform needs none.

I am your friend,

WM. COBBETT.

P. S.—WALTER of the Times has published what he calls a "*CAUTION to the hawkers of Cobbett's Register*;" and then he tells his readers, that a man has been *committed* from the Hatton Garden Police Office, for selling the Register in the streets, *without a Pedlar's Licence*.—There was a man so committed. He has given *bail*; and, we shall see, by-and-by, who is right and who is wrong.—But if I understand the law, the man was, and any man is fully justified in doing what this man was doing. At any rate, if he was acting *illegally*, the streets of this city and the whole country is inundated with illegal transactions.—The public may be assured, that this shall *not be hidden under a bushel*. They may be assured, that no effort shall be wanting to bring this matter to a clear explanation.—In the meanwhile I have to thank WALTER for his "*CAUTION*," which is an *advertisement*, which I could not have bought of him for 20 guineas, and which his stupid, stupid, stupid spite has given me for nothing!—This was what STEWART meant, I suppose, when he said that *SOMETHING must be done*!—Just as if this would do *any thing*! Were it to succeed, I will take care, that it shall put a stop to the hawking of *all other papers*; and, besides, are there not *shops* and *houses* enough to sell from? And will not this very circumstance send thousands of persons to purchase at those shops and houses, who before did not think of it? And the law explicitly says, that *any thing* may, without any Licence, be sold, in *Market Towns* on the *Market Day*.—What stupidity is it, then, to suppose, that the circulation (already, far surpassing that of *all the Daily Papers in London*) can be checked by this "*Caution*!"



## ADVERTISEMENT.

## PAPER AGAINST GOLD.

The 200 Sets of this work, which remained unsold two weeks ago, are now all disposed of, while many applications are unanswered. This being the case, I have put a *New Edition* to press, which will be ready in about three weeks from this time. The Public will be pleased to bear in mind the *Occasion*, which first drew this work forth. The *Two Parties*, in Parliament, in 1810 and 1811, after long and laboured inquiries, reports and discussions on the question, whether the Bank ought to be compelled to pay in Gold and Silver at the end of 2 years from that time, came to these conclusions: the *OUTS*, that the Bank ought to be compelled to pay at the end of the 2 years; and, the *INS*, that though the Bank was solvent, and was *able* to pay at any time, yet, that it would not be *wise*, to *suffer* it to pay in Gold and Silver, till a *time of Peace* came.—Thus did the 2 parties in Parliament decide. In opposition to them both, I contended, and, I believe, clearly *proved*, that the Bank could *NEVER* pay in specie, without a great reduction in the interest of the Debt, of Salaries, Pay, &c. or *without* producing the utter ruin of Agriculture, Trade, Commerce, and Manufactures; and of course, without plunging the country into a state of intolerable misery. *Peace* is come; the Bank does not pay in specie, except in a very small portion; but, even that *little step* towards paying in specie has produced the ruin and misery that I foreboded, and the causes of which were (in 1810 and 1811) so clearly unfolded in this work, and particularly in Letter XV of the collection.—This work contains an account of the origin and progress of that dreadful scourge of this nation and of mankind, the *FUNDING SYSTEM*; it shows how the Bank and the Debt arose together, and that they were engendered by a desire to engage in *Continental Wars*; it shows how fatal the progress of this system has been to the happiness and liberties of this kingdom; it shows how *taxes* and *pauperism* and *crimes* have all kept on in regular increase with the increase of the Debt; it demonstrates that the Sinking Fund cannot *possibly* tend to diminish or to prevent the increase of the Debt; and, above all things, it exposes to the eyes of this abused nation all the *history* and

*mystery* of the *Bank Stoppage*, in 1797, brings forth *by name* all the principal persons who were concerned in that memorable transaction, which has finally been one great cause of ruin, beggary, and almost extinction of many honest, industrious, virtuous families. At the time when this work was written, more than 150 other persons wrote and published pamphlets on the subject; but, if any of those persons had the understanding to receive the truth, not one of them had courage to declare it, while the far greater of them were strenuous advocates for Paper and Funding System.—*Time*, however, which tries most things, has now tried this important question. The crisis of the Funding System is at hand; therefore, I am anxious that this work should *now be read*; and, if it may be within the reach of numerous persons, I shall sell it for 10s. retail, bound in boards, and at 8s. to Booksellers and Newsmen. It will be in *One Octavo Volume*, printed like the Stamped Register in *double columns* and upon the Large Paper, and will be new bound in Boards.—The work will be published by Mr. CLEMENT, at No. 192, Strand, London, who will attend punctually to all the orders for this book, which have been already received, and also to all Orders which may be transmitted to him in future.—My object in publishing this new Edition is not (though that object would be quite proper) much as the desire of having the work read extensively. I stand, in this work, pitted against the opinions of one hundred and fifty preceding authors of pamphlets, and against those of both the Parties in Parliament. *Hitherto* my opinions have been verified by events; and, probably, a few months will decide, whether there be any part of my work to which events will not have affixed the stamp of truth. In this work *clearness* has been principally aimed at; and, I am persuaded that, by keeping this object in view, I have made the most obtruse of all subjects perfectly familiar to any man of common sense. I have, in short, shown how the poor man's dinner has been taken from him, and how work-houses and jails have been filled and gibbets loaded by the means of Bank Paper. My book contains a warning to all the nations in the world, and to my own countrymen in particular. For these reasons I am uncommonly anxious that this work should *now be read*.

## Entered at Stationer's Hall.

Printed by W. MOLINEUX, 5, Bream's Buildings, Chancery Lane; Published by W. M. COBBIN, Jun. No. 8, Catherine Street, Strand; and Retailed at No. 192, Strand; where all communications (post paid) addressed to the Editor, are requested to be forwarded.